

**REMARKS**

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The Final Office Action dated November 1, 2005 has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

Claims 1, 10 and 14 are hereby amended. Claims 2, 11 and 15 are hereby cancelled. Accordingly, claims 1, 3-10, 12-14 and 16-21 are pending. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims are respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 1, 10, 13 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,766,493 to Shin (hereinafter "Shin"). Claims 1, 3-10, 12-14 and 16-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over alleged admitted related art (hereinafter "ARA") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,391,137 to Matsushima (hereinafter "Matsushima"). Claims 1, 3-10, 12-14 and 16-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over alleged admitted related art (hereinafter "ARA") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,675,817 to Doh (hereinafter "Doh").

The rejection of claims 1, 10, 13 and 21 as being anticipated by Shin is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Claim 1 is allowable over Shin in that claim 1 now recites "wherein the step of cleaning exposed surfaces includes dry-etching." This limitation was previously recited in claim 2. Claim 2, now cancelled, was indicated in the Final Office Action dated November 1, 2005 as containing allowable subject matter. Therefore, Shin does not teach at least this feature of the claimed invention. Accordingly, because Shin fails to teach this feature of claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 and claim 21, which depends therefrom, are allowable over Shin.

Claim 10 is allowable over Shin in that claim 10 now recites "wherein the step of cleaning exposed surfaces includes dry-etching." This limitation was previously recited in claim 11. Claim 11, now cancelled, was indicated in the Final Office Action dated November 1, 2005 as containing allowable subject matter. Therefore, Shin does not teach at least this feature of the

claimed invention. Accordingly, because Shin fails to teach this feature of claim 10, Applicant respectfully submit that claim 10 and claim 13, which depends therefrom, are allowable over Shin.

The rejection of claims 1, 3-10, 12-14 and 16-21 as being unpatentable over ARA in view of Matsushima is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested. Also, the rejection of claims 1, 3-10, 12-14 and 16-21 as being unpatentable over ARA in view of Doh is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Claim 1 is allowable over the cited references in that claim 1 now recites “wherein the step of cleaning exposed surfaces includes dry-etching.” This limitation was previously recited in claim 2. Claim 2, now cancelled, was indicated in the Final Office Action dated November 1, 2005 as containing allowable subject matter. Therefore, the cited references do not teach or suggest at least this feature of the claimed invention. Accordingly, because the cited references fail to teach this feature of claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 and claims 3-9 and 21, which depend therefrom, are allowable over the cited references.

Claim 10 is allowable over the cited references in that claim 10 now recites “wherein the step of cleaning exposed surfaces includes dry-etching.” This limitation was previously recited in claim 11. Claim 11, now cancelled, was indicated in the Final Office Action dated November 1, 2005 as containing allowable subject matter. Therefore, the cited references do not teach at least this feature of the claimed invention. Accordingly, because the cited references fail to teach this feature of claim 10, Applicant respectfully submit that claim 10 and claims 12 and 13, which depend therefrom, are allowable over the cited references.

Claim 14 is allowable over the cited references in that claim 14 now recites “wherein the step of cleaning exposed surfaces includes dry-etching.” This limitation was previously recited in claim 15. Claim 15, now cancelled, was indicated in the Final Office Action dated November 1, 2005 as containing allowable subject matter. Therefore, the cited references do not teach at least this feature of the claimed invention. Accordingly, because the cited references fail to teach this feature of claim 14, Applicant respectfully submit that claim 14 and claims 16-20, which depend therefrom, are allowable over the cited references.

Claims 2, 11 and 15 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. These claims are cancelled and therefore the objection to claims 2, 11 and 15 is moot.

Applicant believes the foregoing amendments place the application in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Dated: February 1, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By Valerie P. Hayes  
Valerie P. Hayes  
Registration No.: 53,005  
MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP  
1900 K Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20006  
(202) 496-7500  
Attorney for Applicant